Docket No.: 1190-0761PUS1 Page 9 of 11

## REMARKS

## Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-14 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 6-8, 13, and 14 are independent.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 12 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **Examiner Interview**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner David Harvey for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Jason Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) during the telephonic interview which was conducted on May 6, 2011. An Examiner Interview Summary was made of record as Paper No. 20110506. During the interview, the Examiner notified Applicants' representative that the previous Office Action dated February 18, 2011 and the finality thereof had been withdrawn due to new issues regarding 35 U.S.C. § 112, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph. The Examiner further said that a new non-final Office Action would be sent based on these new issues.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the "recording programming device," the "extension keyword search device," and the "delay device" as recited in the claims are construed as means-plus-function limitations invoking 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. The Examiner further asserts that the written description fails to clearly link structure to the corresponding functions of the aforementioned claim elements.

Without conceding the appropriateness of this rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to remove the means-plus-function language in connection with the aforementioned claim elements. Therefore, 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph, is no longer invoked in connection with the aforementioned elements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard

 Application No.: 10/590,198
 Docket No.: 1190-0761PUS1

 Reply dated September 12, 2011
 Page 10 of 11

Reply to Office Action of May 16, 2011

as the invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

# Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takatori (US 6,252,629) in view of Kato (JP 2003-134431). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 5 and 12 has been amended to depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively. Since the Examiner has indicated that claim 8 is allowable, the amendment to claim 12 automatically places it in condition for allowance along with claim 8. Further, since claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and is not rejected under any other grounds, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 5 automatically places it in condition for allowance along with claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the Examiner's indication that claims 8-11, 13, and 14 have been allowed.

### Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant(s) therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

 Application No.: 10/590,198
 Docket No.: 1190-0761PUS1

 Reply dated September 12, 2011
 Page 11 of 11

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes, Registration No. 47305, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: September 12, 2011

Reply to Office Action of May 16, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.:/29680 BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP 8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P O Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000